

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present case. Claims 1, 9 and 16 are amended herein. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' prior art Figure 1 in view of Robsky et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,838,309).

103 Rejection

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' prior art Figure 1 in view of Robsky et al. (US Patent No. 5,838,309). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as are recited in Claims 1-20 are neither shown nor suggested by Applicants' prior art Figure 1 in view of Robsky et al.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1 which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a display assembly for a portable electronic device comprising:

... a digitizer mechanism comprising a top film and a resistive digitizer element; and a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses said touch screen assembly and said top film of said digitizer mechanism to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover and said digitizer mechanism ...

Independent Claims 9 and 16 recite distinguishing limitations similar to those recited in Claim 1. Claims 2-8 depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 10-15 depend from

independent Claim 9, and Claims 17-20 depend from independent Claim 16 and recite further limitations of the present invention.

The cited combination fails to teach or suggest the embodiments set forth in Claims 1, 9 and 16. In particular, Applicants' prior art Figure 1 does not anticipate or render obvious an integrated enclosure touch screen assembly that includes "a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses said touch screen assembly and said top film of said digitizer mechanism to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover and said digitizer mechanism" as is recited in Claim 1 (claims 9 and 16 contain similar limitations). By contrast, Applicants' prior art Figure 1 only shows a touch screen assembly that includes a digitizer mechanism and an outermost protective film wherein the outermost protective film merely covers the digitizer film.

It should be appreciated that Applicants' Claim 1 sets forth specific attributes of the therein recited cover enclosure that are not shown or suggested by Applicants' prior art Figure 1. For example, nowhere in Applicants' prior art Figure 1 is there shown or suggested a cover enclosure that is disposed over and encloses a touch screen assembly and a cover film. Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 9 and 16 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Applicants' prior art Figure 1.

The cited combination does not render Claims 1, 9 and 16 obvious because the teachings of Robsky et al. do not remedy the shortcomings of the Applicants' prior art

Figure 1 noted above. Specifically, the Applicants' prior art Figure 1 in view of Robsky et al. does not render obvious an integrated enclosure touch screen assembly that includes "a single piece cover enclosure for said touch screen assembly that is disposed over and encloses said touch screen assembly and said top film of said digitizer mechanism to allow mechanical transfer between said single piece cover and said digitizer mechanism" as is recited in Claim 1 (claims 9 and 16 contain similar limitations). Robsky et al. only teaches a self-tensioning membrane touch screen (see abstract). It should be noted that structure 24 of Robsky et al. is equated to the single piece cover enclosure of Claim 1 in the outstanding Office Action. As is shown in by Robsky et al. at Figure 1, structure 24 only partially encloses components of the touch screen assembly that is disclosed by Robsky et al. In fact, nowhere in the Robsky et al. reference is a cover enclosure that is disposed over and encloses a touch screen assembly and a cover film shown or suggested. Consequently, the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are set forth in Claims 1, 9 and 16 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Applicants' prior art Figure 1 and Robsky et al. either alone or in combination.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' prior art Figure 1 and Robsky et al., either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as is set forth in Claims 1, 9, and 16 and, as such, Claims 1, 9, and 16 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-8 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 10-15 dependent on Claim 9, and Claim 17-20 dependent on Claim 16 likewise overcome the cited combination as being dependent on an allowable base claim and therefore are themselves in condition for allowance.

SUMMARY


In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application and allowance of the pending Claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Reginald A. Ratliff at (408) 938-9060.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 8/25, 2004


Reginald A. Ratliff
Registration No.: 48,098
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060